

Q U E R I E S

U P O N

Q U E R I E S:

O R

Enquiries into certain Q U E R I E S

U P O N

D^r. PIERCE'S Sermon

at Whitehall, Feb. 1.

The third Edition.



Printed for R. Royston, Bookseller to his
most Sacred Majesty.

QUERIES

AND

QUERIES

OR

Enquiries into certain QUERIES

UNION

D. P. L. E. R. C. E. S.

as published by

The London



Printed for J. G. B. Bookseller to his
Majesty the King

Queries upon Queries.

QUERIE I.

WHether for the *Papists* with *restlesse importunities* to sollicite for an *indulgence*, be to *sit down peaceably* and *grant themselves erroneous*? Do they call that only a *sitting down peaceably*, not to grow *outrageous*, and *arming* themselves with *publick force* to fight for their *Religion*? or is it not moreover not to *repine* at their present *happiness*, and to *desist* from *craving* any *publick favour*? If you *grant your selves erroneous*, is it *fit* you should be *indulg'd* in your *errors*? Is it not *favour* enough to be *Conniv'd* at, when there are such *sanguinary laws* in *force* against you, which, if his Majesty so pleas'd, might be put into execution? Or if he should *gratifie* you, since you are so *erroneous* as to *advance* the *Pope's Supremacy* above that of *Kings*, whether when you have gathered *strength* by being *cherished* under his *wing*, will you not take the *boldness* to *assert* what you have now the *confidence* to *affirm*, and proceed from *humble desires* of *publick favour* and *indulgence*, to *impudent demands* of *publick Countenance* and *settlement*? If so, whether it be not *seasonable* to give the *King* a *Caveat* against such *Dissenters*, who are wont to *sit down peaceably* no longer then they must *needs*?

QUERIE II.

Though his Majesty had *declared* his *Resolution* against your *Doctrines* before, yet was that *Resolution* so strong that 'twas impossible to *fortifie* it? or were there like to be no *assaults* made against it? If not, whence come your frequent desires of a

Toleration ? If there were, was there not need also of a *Confirmation* ? Do you not too much *over-value* the *Courtiers*, when you say *they neither know the Fathers and other Authors, nor can judge of those quotations* the Sermon does *referre to* ? If they don't *know*, nor can't *judge*, must you needs imply them so *stupid* as to be *incapable of instruction* ? If they have no *reason* to *suspect* them, nor *ability* to *view or disprove* the *quotations*, why may they not *satisfie themselves* without an *Ocular search* ? If they have, they are submitted to *their Examination* as well as *yours*, and 'tis no question but you will both find them to be *exact*. How could the Preacher know but that *some of you* would *hear him* ? He might *assure himself* you were usually *present*, though not as *Auditours*, yet as *Spies*; if not to be *converted* by it, yet to *pick quarrels* at the Sermon. And presuming you there, why might he not *intend to convert* you, when he knew that what he *delivered* was able to *perswade* you, if it did not meet with *prejudices* more *invincible* then your *judgments* to *subdue* ? Might not the *Discourse* be *directed* to check your *insolence*, who upon the King's *Declaration* began to walk *undisguis'd* : or to *prevent* the growth of *Popery*, that though you *compass'd* Sea and land, yet you might *gain* no more *Profelytes* by your *industry* ? or---&c.

Q U E R I E III.

Suppose we should say, by *what was from the Beginning* we mean *Primitive examples* : Can these be no *rule of Reformation*, because we are not to *doe as men have done*, but as men *ought to doe* ? Does not the same *Reason* destroy all *Patterns*, and oblige us to abstain even from *doing well*, because others have *done so before us* : Christ, to *reform the Pharisees*, sends them to the *Beginning* for a *Rule* ; we, to *reform the Romanists*, send them to the *Beginning* too. If *Christ* did as he *ought*, why may not we *imitate* him, and at the same time *doe what has been done*,

done, and what ought to be done? If not — Blasphemy. If to doe as has been done, and as ought to be done, which you so carefully distinguish, be inconsistent; Is it not easy to inferre, because the Papists doe now as they have done, therefore they doe not as they ought to doe? Suppose again, that we understand Primitive Rules contain'd in Scripture: As for those Articles which lye plain and open, they need not the Light either of yours, or ours, or anothers Interpretation to discover them; so that your Dilemma has no horns, or but blunt ones: As for the other, the Querie is, whether you or we more closely follow the confess'd Rules of interpretation. If you have, do you not lay that crime to your own charge, which we endeavour but to prove you guilty of, a partiality in your own cause? If we have, why do you still hugge your own errors, and not rather close with our Truths, while our Arms are open to embrace you?

Q U E R I E IV.

When you imply that the Preacher in *Contending only for the old Protestant way*, contended not for *that* which was from the *Beginning*: what do you mean by the *old Protestant way*? That *good old way*, before it had the Name of Protestant, or after? If before, it was and is the same way which was from the *beginning*; and did not he in *contending* for it, contend for *that* which was from the *beginning*? If after, he confesses 'twas so call'd p. 36. *because the Assertors of it protested against the cruel edict of Worms*, and that the Title was almost as novel as a very great part of the *Roman Creed* is; why then do you say, that he contended only for the *New*, when 'twas indeed for the *old Protestant way*? When you say, that the *Eastern Churches claim a greater Antiquity then ours*; do you mean, the *Articles* of their *faith* were more *Ancient*, or they were more *early* in *embracing* them? If the former; why is it not prov'd? If the latter; what is it to the purpose? Do we pretend to have re-

ceiv'd the Christian faith before *all* other Churches: or rather do we not avow our selves to own the same *Truths*, which if they receiv'd sooner, yet both of us from the *Beginning*?

QUERIE V.

It had been said, *Serm. p. 10.* That in matters of Indifference which are brought into the Government, every Church has the liberty to make her own Constitutions; but we are to look upon nothing as an Article of Faith, unless it comes from the Beginning, &c. Which passage did you read, or no? If not, why do you undertake to make *Queries* upon it? If you did, why do you talk of *Surplices*, *Organs*, *Bishopricks*, *Officials*, *Pluralities*, &c. and take so much pains to no purpose, unless it be to amuse the ignorant and unobserving Reader? Did the Sermon say *all things* must be reduced to what they were in the Beginning, or only *Articles of Faith*? And are *Organs*, &c. *Articles of Faith*? While you personate the *Fanatick*, don't you talk as impertinently as if you indeed were one? But, perhaps, the whole *Querie* was rais'd on purpose to tell the world, the *Preacher* had *Pluralities*. If so, why had you not withall told us, how he came by them? Not by purchase, but desert? not by seeking, but acceptance, when they were cast upon him? That they are *Dignities*, not *Cures*? But setting all this aside, Do you think him worthy of his *Preferments*, or not? If not, why do you bestow one upon him? for he was never *Canon of York* till you made him. If you do, why do you envy him, and discover this envy, in reckoning his being *Chaplain to the King* as one of those *Preferments*, when the world knows there's nothing but trouble and honour, no *Emolument* at all? Whether therefore is it lawful to *dissemble* and *falsifie*, or no? If not, why do you do it? If it be, sure from the Beginning, unless among the *Romanists*, it was not so.

Querie

Q U E R I E VI.

Whether there be any *Herese* in the world which never had a *Beginning*? If not, whether it may not be said to begin with its first *Authour* and raiser? If so, whether all of the same *perswasion* may not derive their *Antiquity* from him? Why then may not the *Disciplinarians* fetch theirs as far as the *Heretick Acrius*, who says as plainly as *Epiphanius* can make him speak, that a *Bishop* does not at all excel a *Presbyter*, either in order, honour, or dignity? Whether was *S. Peter* any more then an ordinary *Presbyter* or no? If he was, then he was not the first *Presbyterian*, as you would have him. If he was not, how come his *Successours* to be *Bishops*? If a *Presbyter* and a *Bishop* be all one, why does not the *Bishop* of *Rome* level himself with his brother *Presbyters*? And why may not the *Socinian* look upon *Sabellius*, who, if *Epiphanius* speaks truth, did think such a thing as that the *Son* and holy *Ghost* were no *Gods*, or not coequal and coeternal with the *Father*? But to stir that no farther which stinks already, To what end is your whole sixth *Querie* directed? Is it any advantage to your Cause, whether the *Anabaptists* look upon *Agrippinus*, the *Solifidians* upon *Eunomius*, or no? Are you angry that such *petite heresies* should have founders of so great names, while your own great one pretends to *S. Peter*, but has indeed none? Were you not afraid, lest the other parts of your *Ramphlet* should fall under the censure of the *Preacher's* pen, and therefore endeavour'd by such little plots to divert him? If you were, Whether your whole *Religion*, like your *Queries*, have any more then a flattering outside, not to be search'd into by a severer eye then that of a Novice?

Querie:

Q U E R I E VII

When *Christ* tells *S. Peter*, his *faith* should not fail, did he mean it should be impossible to deceive him? Are those *Scriptures* that speak of full Assurance of faith, to be understood of full perfection of knowledge? When our Saviour says that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against his Church, are the words to be understood of infallibility or perpetuity? To enter into Heaven through persecutions and tribulations, is it not to be saved so as by fire? Were not those imprison'd spirits, the souls of those who perish'd in the Flood, and were reserv'd in some safe, but tolerable custody, till *Christ* came and preach'd Repentance to them, which, upon their delivery, immediately vanish'd? Or if Purgatory be that prison, is it not an excellent employment for the Pope to be the Gaoler? Was *Maximilian* the second forc'd by the Protestants, or by the Reasonableness of the thing it self, to write that Letter asserting Priest's Marriage, considering all which *Thuanus* says is, that he did it *Re ipsâ urgente*? Why is it not as lawfull to marry, as to keep a Concubine, one being allowed by God, the other by the Pope only? Why did *Scotus* say that Transubstantiation was not a Truth before the Lateran Council, if he might not be quoted for it? And when he says *non fuit dogma fidei*, who taught you thus to construe it, that 'twas onely forecast till then? May not a man be damn'd for eating that bread, and drinking that wine unworthily, which represents the Body and Blood of *Christ*? Again, Did *Christ* give the Bread to any but Disciples and Ministers, or not? If not, why doe you not withhold this from the Laity too? If he did, how does it appear that he gave them not wine also? If there were none besides Disciples present at the Administration, how could *Christ* give either Bread or Wine to them, they being not there to receive it? If there were any, by the same evidence by which it appears they were

were there, is it not clear likewise that they received both? When the Christians went from house to house breaking Bread, would it not be a hard case, if they should have no drink to it? Did they not encourage Nero to cloath them with Beasts-skins by confining themselves to Horse-meals, it being fit their garb should be sutable to their fare? Suppose the Jewish Liturgy was in Hebrew, could not the Jews understand that Hebrew, no, not their Mother-tongue? Were not the Profelytes to their Religion proficient in their Language too? If not, how came they to be Profelytes, the only probable way of their Conversion being either by reading the Jew's Books, or conversing with their persons? and could they doe either without understanding their Language? If they were, though the Jewish Liturgy were in Hebrew, why could they not understand it? You grant the Primitive Liturgies were in Greek and Latine; were not they the most Common Tongues, one of the Eastern, the other of the Western world? If ignorance of the Tongue had been requisite, why did they suffer them to remain in such known Languages? If praying in an unknown Tongue was established by primitive practice before Gregory the Great's time, was that practice corrupt or no? If it was, why did he establish it by an Ecclesiastical Law? If not, how do you reconcile it with S. Paul's command to pray with understanding? 1 Cor. 14. If Invocation of Saints were heard of in Ignatius his time, it was not in Christ's, who forbids us to pray to Angels, which sure are greater Favourites then the Saints. If an Universal Supremacy was from S. Peter by right, though it could not be got till Boniface the third, did Gregory the Great know that it was his Right, or no? If he did, why was he so injurious to S. Peter himself, and that See, as to disclaim it, and that with so much spleen and indignation, as to call him Antichrist who should usurp it? If not, how comes the Enquirer to be wiser then his Holiness? If that Pope was Infallible, then Omniscient too; and if you know more then he, you must know more

then *he* who *knows* all things; then likewise *Boniface* must be *Antichrist*, because *Gregory* says so: If he was not, how did his *Successors* gain that *Prerogative*, who had far less knowledge than himself?

QUERIE VIII.

May not the *Catholick Church* have many parts, and yet preserve its unity? As in the same *Natural body* there are many *Members*, yet but one *Body*. Are not the *Churches* of the several *Kingdoms* of *Christendome* these parts? Whether is it possible for *Corruptions* either in *Doctrin* or *Government* to creep into them? If not, how came they into the *Church of Rome*? If it be, is the *Church* so corrupted to be *Reform'd* or not? If not, why does not our *Saviour* permit the *Pharisees* quietly to enjoy their old *Customes* of *Divorce*? If a *Member* be diseased, may we not endeavour after a *Cure*? If it may be *Reform'd*, what *Physician* must we consult? Must we go to *Rome* for a *Remedy*? from thence possibly come our *Corruptions*, and can we expect a *Reformation* from them? Will the same *Enemy* that sow'd our *Tares*, pull them up too? Can the *sword* which made the wound, become the *plaster*? Is not every *King* *Supreme* in his own *Dominions*? Have we not the same warrantable *Rules* of *Reformation*, plain *Scripture*, *Natural Reason*, and *Moral Prudence*, which others have? If we are *Corrupt*, why may not *he* reform us? Does *Christ* bid us follow a *Multitude* to do evil? or rather are we not commanded to let them depart from us, and purge our selves to a *Primitive integrity*? Is that *one way* we are all bid to be of to be found in the *Roman* or the *English Church*? If you say in the *Roman*, where do you read that? If in the *English*, do you not walk in a *wrong way*, because in a way that is not

Q U E R I E IX.

Were our *Reformers* here in *England* members of the *Catholick Church*, or no? If not, then the *Roman Church* is no part of the *Catholick*, because they were of the *Roman Faith*, and yet according to you not *Catholicks*. If they were, may the same person be a member of the *Catholick*, and the Head of a particular Church, or not? If not, do you not split your self upon those dangerous Assertions, That a King can be no *Christian*, or a *Christian* no King? If he may, why may he not reform the Church he is Head of, as head of that part, though not as a Member of the whole? If therefore those Members of our Church who desire a farther Reformation, were Heads of it too, they might reform us: but so long as they are only Members, I think they may not; what think you? If it be your judgement, that they may, why might not our first Reformers, though Members of the *Roman Church*, yet reform it? If you think that the Head only can reform, whether is the King Head of the Church which is in his own Kingdome or no? If not, are you not traitorous, while you go about to rob him of his Supremacy, and do you not deserve favour and indulgence from him? If he be, why do you quarrel with our first Reformers, when you know the chief of them was the King?

Q U E R I E X.

Whether those points commanded to be believed by the Council of Trent upon pain of damnation, were to be believed upon that severe penalty, before the sitting of that Council. If they were, then those are damned who died before the Creation of those Articles, because they did not believe them; how then fare the souls of our Sires? If not, was not that a Charitable Council, to make the way to Heaven narrower then

Christ had *left* it: But supposing, with you, that they were not *necessary*, the *Querie* will be, whether they were *lawful* before it. If they *were*, then were they not *added* by the *Council of Trent*, as you acknowledge they were, but *establish'd* by a more *Ancient* Sanction: If *not*, could that *Council* make an *Article of Faith*, which is beyond the *power of any Authority under heaven to doe*? Gal. i. 8. Can that which is *unlawful* in it self, be made *lawful* by a *Command*? or may the *daughters* drink *poison*, because they are *bid* to doe so by their *Mother*? or if they might, is not *Rome* a kind *Mother*, that will *prescribe* it? Suppose again, that those *points* were *Antecedently indifferent*, such as *might* be *believ'd*, or *might not*; were they *enjoyn'd* because they *might* be *believ'd*, or because they *might not*? If because they *might*, then either that *doctrine* may be *believ'd* which is not *Apostolical*, contrary to *S. Paul*; or those *Injunctions* were *Apostolical*, contrary to *your selves*, who confess they were *New*. If because they *might not*, Oh the power of the *Council of Trent*, which can make us *believe* those things that an *Angel from Heaven* may not do! How does it now follow, because a *lawful Magistrate* may command a *lawful thing* to be *done* upon pain of *damnation*, *disobedience* to a *lawful command* being *dammable*; therefore the *Council of Trent* may as well command *things to be believ'd* that are utterly *unlawful*, upon the same penalty?

QUERIE XI.

What do you mean by the *Church*? The *virtual Church*, as you are pleas'd to call the *Pope*? or the *Representative Church*, as you alwaies *style* your *Councils*? or, as we understand it; The *whole Company of Believers*? If you take it in this latter sense, the *Scriptures* and the *Primitive Fathers* were to be *found* in the *Church*; why might we not then have
recourse

recourse to them? When we suspected that the *Pragmatical Romanists* deliver'd to us *Traditions of men*, instead of the *Doctrines of the Gospel*, might we not *consult* those *Oracles* for *satisfaction*? If in the two former senses, why might we not *run from the Church*, i. e. from the *Pope* and his *Councils*, to the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*? If we *might*, have you any *reason* to be angry with our *Reformers* for *doing* what you *allow* them? If *not*, do you not *advance* your *own Constitutions* above those of the *Scriptures* and the *Fathers*, while you *will* us to obey *yours* and *slight theirs*? Again, Let us by the *Church* understand the whole *number of Christians* that liv'd betwixt *Christ's daies* and those of our *Reformers*, call'd by you the *Essential Church*; was there not in that great *Intervall of time* a *succession of different Ages and Centuries*? Did not a *part* of this *whole number of Christians* fill up those several *Ages*? Do we not call those the *Primitive Christians*, that the *Primitive Church*, which liv'd and flourish'd in the *Age of Christ*, or the *Centuries next succeeding*? Had not you in the *latter Ages*, by *entertaining new Articles of Faith*, by *introducing other Doctrines* then what were from the *Beginning*, corrupted your selves, and so became *Separatists* from the *Primitive faith, truth, and Church*? Why might not our *Reformers* then make a *secession* from the *corrupted Romanists*, as they did from the *purser Christians*? If there be any *difference* in the *Schisms*, 'tis this; you *separated* from the *Primitive* by *defiling*, we from you by *reforming* our selves: And which, I pray, is the *greater credit*?

QUERIE XII.

Whether when the *Protestants* left *Rome*, they did not take the *Scriptures*, the *Primitive Church*, and the *four first general Councils* along with them. If they did not, why don't you shew

shew us that *Tota* us to which they left them? If they did rake them, is it any doubt whether they left them?

QUERIE XIII.

Whether he that said *Ferusalem* was the *Mother Church* of the *Jews*, did not say *Antioch* was the *Mother*, at least the *eldest*, *Church of the Gentiles*? If so, is it possible that *Rome* should be their *Mother* too? If there be two mothers, must not *Rome*, which was the *latter*, be a *step-mother* to them? And are they not like to lead a *prosperous* and *happy* life under such an *indulgent* Matron, who is wont even to *kill* her children out of *very kindness* to them?

QUERIE XIV.

If *S. Peter* brought *Christianity* into *Britain*, as *Gildas* sayes, and you consent, whether this will not exempt the *British Church* from any subjection to the *See of Rome*. If ever *Peter* was there (which is a question not to be decided) did he bring it hither before he carried it thither, or after? If before, why must we, who were the *first Christians*, trundle under *Rome* that is our *junior*? If after, was it while he was living, or after his *Death*? If while alive, what will become of your *pretensions*, that he seated himself at *Rome*, there exercised *Episcopal Authority*, and dying there bequeath'd his chaire to *Clemens*, or *Linus*, and the succeeding *Popes*? If in his absence he left a *Deputy*, it will seem strange that one mans head should sit anothers shoulders: If not, twill be more strange that the body should tarry there while the head travail'd into *England*. If after his *Death*, are we not beholding to him that he would rise out of his *grave*, and take such a long journey to plant the *Gospel* here? And will it not become you who are so much devoted to *S. Peter*, to own us for your *Superiors*, if for no other Reason, yet for the *miraculous plantation*?

QUERIE XV.

Whether you doe well to make a *Comparison* between *Henry 8.* and *Phocas*, who was indeed an *incomparable* villain. Was not one a *King* by *Birth*, the other of an *obscure parentage*, and by *merit* but a *Centurion*? One came to his *Crown* by *rightfull* succession, the other to the *Empire* by the *unnatural* murder of his Master *Mauritius* and his children. One had reason to be displeas'd at *Clement 7.* who had so often deluded him in his appeals, so long usurp'd what was his *Right*; the other had not the same reason to be displeas'd at *Cyriacus*, who could not invade his *Right*, that had no other *Right* to be invaded but what *blond* and *rapine* could give him to the *gallants*. Suppose he had been the *lawfull Emperour*, if he had denied *Cyriacus* the Title of *Universal*, and made himself *supreme* within his own *Dominions*, he had done well. And did *H. 8.* who was indeed our *lawful King*, doe any more then throw off the *Pope*, and restore his own *Supremacy* to himself? You applaud *Phocas* his justice for *robbing Constantinople*, and placing the Title of *Universal* in the *Bishop* of *Rome*, that being the chief *Seat* of his *Empire*; would you have been content if *H. 8.* when he degraded *Clement*, had made the *Bishop* of *London* *Universal*, that being the *Metropolis* of his *Kingdome*? If not, do you not doe to others as you would not be done to your selves, in permitting *Phocas* to strip *Cyriacus*, and not suffering *King H.* to doe the like to you? If you would, why do you appropriate that title to your selves, while you confesse that, if the *King* had so pleas'd, the *Bishop* of *London* might have been as *Universal* as my Lord of *Rome* is?

QUERIE XVI.

S. Peter saies *Christ* is the *Corner-stone*, 1 Pet. 2. 6. you say *S. Peter* is: which must we hearken to? If *S. Peter* were a
pillar.

pillar, could he be a *Corner-stone* too? Whether *S. Paul* knew *S. Peter* or no? If not, why did he not excuse himself for rebuking him, as he did for his reviling the *High priest*, with an *I wist not who he was*? If he did, sure he knew him to be not so much, or no more then his equal, when he rebuk'd him so openly, and made no *Apology* for his boldness neither. Whether the *Pope* be not *S. Peter's* successor, as in his *Chair*, so in his *Disimulation* too, because he can pretend to *humility* in the midst of so great *pride*, and exactly counterfeit it, while he has such an *Absolute Authority*. Whether from this *Humility* does not proceed his so inveterate *Enmity* to *Ambition* in others, that he will not suffer them to aspire beyond his own great toe. Whether *S. Paul* might not be born among the *Jews*, and yet Preach among the *Heathens*; and so though he were an *Hebrew* of *Hebrews* by parentage, yet be an *Apostle* of the *Gentiles* by employment? If the *Pope* be *Lord of Kings*, as you say, does he not Lord it over *God's* heritage? Are *Kings*, no part of *God's* heritage? Does not *Christ's* *Vicar* too much disgrace his master, by condescending so farre as to be the servant of the servants of *God*? They that rule over the *Gentiles* exercise *Lordship*; but do our *Lords Bishops* rule over the *Gentiles*? A *Gentile* and a *Heathen*, you say, are all one: and is it not enough to make us *Hereticks*, but you must make us *Heathens* too? and so neither keep *Faith* with us, because we are *Hereticks*, nor suffer us to hold the same *Faith* with you, because we are *Heathens*?

Imprimatur. Dan. Nicols, R. P. D.
Arch. Cant. Capel. Domesticus.

Ex ædibus Lambethanis
Martii 21. 1663.

FINIS.